## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant acknowledges, with thanks, the office action dated January 10, 2008, and completion of the telephonic interview of March 3, 2008. The Examiner's observations and suggestions are much appreciated and summarized herein.

The Examiner's withdrawal of previous rejections made under 35 U.S.C. §112 is noted with appreciation. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to correct informalities objected to by the Examiner. Claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-14 are currently pending.

Claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,127,524 to Renda et al. (*hereinafter*, "Renda") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,416 to Gregg et al. (*hereinafter*, "Gregg"). In view of the amendments and arguments set forth below, it is submitted that all pending claims are patentably distinct over the art of record.

The subject application is directed to a system and method for role-based control of a document processing device. An electronic document is received into a document processing device via an associated network and a scan file is generated corresponding to a scan of a tangible document rendered by the document processing device. A document processing instruction for a document processing operation to be performed on at least one of the electronic document and a received tangible document is also received via an associated network. User data of an identity of a user of a document processing device is acquired via the associated network, wherein the user data is associated with the received electronic document. The user provides login data, after prompting thereof, via an interface associated with the document processing device. Device access data of device access privileges associated with each of a plurality of users, user data, and login data is compared with the device access data, and the login data is associated with at least one preselected user role. A permission matrix template specifying allowable usage options of the data processing device associated with each of a plurality of user roles is retrieved, and permission matrix data is generated as in accordance with the at least one preselected user role and retrieved permission matrix template, the permission matrix data including data representative of allowable usage options of the document processing device from a plurality thereof by a user associated with the user data. The permission matrix data is then communicated to the document processing device to allow for control thereof. The permission matrix is stored on a data storage associated with the document processing device, and the operation of the document processing device is limited to a subset of available operations in accordance with the stored permission matrix.

Renda is directed to a system wherein devices analyze a MAC address of network transmissions. Network access is determined in accordance with settings associated with a MAC address. Gregg is directed to a system that monitors subscription-based access to digital content. Thus, both Renda and

Gregg are directed to control of access to external resources, which determination is made in connection with outgoing requests rendered from a device. Conversely, the subject application teaches a system wherein a user's ability to use a document processing device is dictated locally, at the device, by a permission matrix resident in the device. As an example noted in the specification, one such constraint may be a limitation that does not allow a user to view or reorder print jobs that have been queued in a local device.

Amendments to each of independent claims 1 and 8 have been made commensurate with the afore-noted distinctions and, further, in line with the discussions of the interview. More particularly, by virtue of the subject amendments, each claim now includes limitations, wherein a document processing device includes a controller memory wherein permission matrix data is stored. User access to the device is constrained in accordance with a local test of rights in relation to those set forth in the permission matrix. No network access to digital content or resources is required to allow for a decision to be made by an external device.

In accordance with the afore-noted amendments and comments, it is submitted that all claims are patentably distinct over the art and in condition for allowance thereover. An early allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 66329/00141.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _3 - 6 - 08_

Susan L. Mizer
Registration No. 38,245
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
1150 Huntington Bldg.
925 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio  44115-1414
**Customer No.:  23380**
Tel.:    (216) 696-3466
Fax:    (216) 592-5009

66329:00141\982220.1